

Medicare. We wanted to get the 10 years of solvency that had been supported by the President and other Members of the Congress and then deal with the long-term issues. I think if the Senator wanted to, we could spend some time looking at the increase of home health care and the decrease in hospitalization.

But the bottom line is patients go, by and large, in the health care system where the doctor tells them. If the doctor tells them, you need to get to that hospital tonight, by and large, patients go there. If the doctor says, you need to have those services, by and large, the patients get them. When we are talking about individuals who have incomes of roughly \$7,700 being told they can get an offset in the State. We know the number of children, for example, that fall under the Medicaid proposals that are not covered by Medicaid. And the seniors are facing the same thing.

So I just think that, let alone, as the chairman has pointed out, the very poor can get some of this offset or will get it offset in terms of the Medicaid that is requiring the States to collect it. We have heard a great deal about putting additional burdens on the States, but it seems we are willing to do so as long as we get the additional funds for the tax cuts.

I thank the chairman of the Finance Committee for his response, and I appreciate his courtesy in responding to these questions. I will be glad to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order for not to exceed 10 minutes without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

#### CLIMATE ISSUES AT THE DENVER SUMMIT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, press reports today from the annual economic summit of the world's major industrial powers in Denver indicate that there was pressure on the United States from some of our allies to make new commitments to deep cutbacks on greenhouse gas emissions, specifically, carbon dioxide emissions. It is unfortunate that some of our allies, including the French in particular, chose this forum to change the terms of international dialogue on this issue. I commend President Clinton for resisting these surprising, new pressure tactics to shortcut the progress towards a reasonable solution at Kyoto and to try to force the United States to endorse an immediate commitment to unworkable new goals, thereby, shredding the negotiating process. We and the French are both part of negotiations intended as a follow-up to the United Nations Frame-

work Convention on Climate Change, the so-called Rio Pact, signed in 1992, and approved by the Senate. The Rio Pact called upon the industrialized nations to aim to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to their 1990 levels by the year 2000, a goal which will not be achieved by the U.S. or by most of the industrialized nations.

As a result of the failure of most of the industrialized world to meet this voluntary commitment to reduce Carbon dioxide emissions, the parties met in Berlin in 1995 to discuss the future direction of the treaty. In Berlin, the United States agreed that new commitments should be binding upon the signatories, but the developing world was excluded from any new commitments. Unfortunately, excluding the developing world, which will be the most important emitter of carbon dioxide emissions by the year 2015, exceeding the emissions of the OECD nations, was a mistake. The solution, if it is to be effective, must include all major emitting nations or it will fail to really get the problem under control. More than that, the perceived unfairness of forcing limits on the economies of only some nations, but not others, will cause political pressure to frustrate the approval and implementation of any treaty that is signed in Kyoto this December. The temptations of industries to flee from the U.S. for example, behind the safe non-binding walls of Mexico, for instance, or other developing nations, will both frustrate the goals of a treaty and unfairly penalize the developed economies.

Therefore, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL, and I authored a Sense of the Senate Resolution indicating that it is imperative for the developing world to be parties to any binding commitments made in Kyoto, that those so-called commitments should demonstrate unequivocally an action program to approach this problem in a realistic way, and that everyone should start with aggressive efforts to act on those commitments immediately and not settle for vague promises to return to future negotiations to get serious. While some countries have different levels of development, each must make unique and binding contributions of a kind consistent with their industrialization. The developing world must agree in Kyoto to some manner of binding commitments which would begin at the same time as the developed world with as aggressive and effective a schedule as possible given the gravity of the problem and the need for a fair sharing of the burden.

Mr. President, in Denver during the last two days, some nations put pressure on the United States to agree to a whole new set of commitments beyond those agreed to in Rio, beyond the target of stabilizing at 1990 levels by the year 2010. Those nations sought to get the U.S. to agree to a 15 percent reduction by 2010, a level of reduction which would have very serious impacts on

major sectors of the U.S. economy. There were no discussions of bringing the developing world into the play. I highly commend President Clinton for resisting these surprising new pressures to deviate from the Kyoto track, and set targets for very sharp new levels of reductions. Those nations should know that the United States Senate stands strongly behind the President in resisting these pressures. Reductions must be fair, well-managed, well-planned, and spread across the globe—spread across the globe. In addition, Mr. President, a wide-ranging new set of initiatives is needed to harness technology, to engage in new crash research and development technologies to mitigate the carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel combustion, as well as new energy efficiency programs, and cooperative programs between the developed and developing world. We have only begun to match the targets of carbon dioxide reductions and limitations with our technological genius and to engage in pioneering a new energy frontier type program aimed at using man's genius to tackle this global problem from every conceivable angle.

I reiterate, Mr. President, that President Clinton is to be commended for resisting the pressure for these sudden draconian commitments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from New Mexico so much time as he needs to make his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his courtesy, as always.

Let me speak for a few moments on a motion, or amendment, that is going to be offered by the Senator from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator REED, and myself. This is a motion to strike one provision that is in this reconciliation bill which would change the age at which senior citizens become eligible for Medicare. It raises that age from 65 to 67. Our amendment would propose to strike that provision from the reconciliation bill. In my view this is an unacceptable provision, it is very misguided, and one that we should not continue to keep in this legislation if we send this legislation on through the legislative process.